

1
2
3
4
5 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
6 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
7

8 JUDY LARSON,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 CLARK COUNTY, a political
12 subdivision of the STATE OF
13 NEVADA,

14 Defendant.
15

2:11-CV-879 JCM (PAL)

16 **ORDER**

17 On May 31, 2011, plaintiff filed the instant action against Clark County, alleging various
18 Title VII and state law claims. (Doc. # 1). Specifically, plaintiff's complaint asserts seven causes of
19 action: (1) gender discrimination, (2) age discrimination, (3) hostile work environment, (4)
20 retaliation, (5) concerted action, (6) breach of contract, and (7) negligent and intentional infliction
21 of emotional distress. (Doc. # 7).

22 This court entered an order granting summary judgment in favor of defendant on plaintiff's
23 Title VII federal claims (*i.e.*, gender discrimination, age discrimination, hostile work environment,
24 and retaliation). (Doc. # 24). Defendant then filed a motion seeking summary judgment as to
25 plaintiff's remaining state law causes of action (*i.e.*, concerted action, breach of contract, and
26 negligent and intentional infliction of emotional distress). (Doc. # 27).

27 ...
28

1 Jurisdiction in this case is based on the presence of a federal question, and the court has
2 supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367. Under 28 U.S.C.
3 § 1367(c)(3), a district court may decline to exercise jurisdiction over supplemental state law claims
4 if “the district court has dismissed all claims over which it has original jurisdiction.” Generally,
5 “when federal claims are dismissed before trial . . . pendent state claims should also be dismissed.”
6 *Religious Tech. Ctr. v. Wollersheim*, 971 F.2d 364, 367-68 (9th Cir. 1992).

7 Here, considering judicial economy, convenience, fairness, and comity, and because summary
8 judgment has been granted on all of plaintiff’s federal claims, the court will decline to exercise
9 supplemental jurisdiction over the remaining state law claims. *See Carnegie-Mellon Univ. v. Cohill*,
10 484 U.S. 343, 350 n. 7 (1988); *City of Colton v. Am. Promotional Events, Inc.-West*, 614 F.3d 998,
11 1008 (9th Cir. 2010) (“Because the district court did not err in granting summary judgment on the
12 federal claims, it did not abuse its discretion in dismissing the state-law claims.”).

13 Accordingly,

14 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that plaintiff’s remaining state-
15 law claims be, and the same hereby are, DISMISSED without prejudice.

16 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the clerk of the court close this case consistent with this
17 order.

18 DATED November 8, 2012.

19
20 
21

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
22
23
24
25
26
27
28